



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,342	06/30/2008	Kazushige Ito	296119US0PCT	9905
22850	7590	07/12/2010	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.			THOMAS, ERIC W	
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2831	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/12/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/593,342	Applicant(s) ITO ET AL.
	Examiner Eric Thomas	Art Unit 2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/11/06, 10/25/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The current abstract is two paragraphs long.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (US 6,403,513).

Sato et al. disclose a multilayer ceramic capacitor comprising a laminate including alternately stacked dielectric layers (2) of a sintered compact composed of crystal particles of a dielectric porcelain composite and internal-electrode layers (3), wherein the dielectric porcelain composite at least comprises a primary constituent containing barium titanate (abstract, line 2, example 12 – **100 mol**);

a first accessory constituent composed of at least one of magnesium oxide (MgO), calcium oxide (CaO), barium oxide (BaO), and strontium oxide (SrO) (abstract, line 3, example 12 – **1 mol**);

a second accessory constituent containing silicon oxide as a major constituent (abstract, lines 4-5, example 12 - **3 mol**);

a third accessory constituent composed of at least one of vanadium oxide (V_2O_5), molybdenum oxide (MoO_3), and tungsten oxide (WO_3) (abstract, line 7, example 12 - **0.1 mol**);

a fourth accessory constituent composed of an oxide of R1 (wherein R1 is at least one of Sc, Er, Tm, Yb, and Lu) (abstract, lines 8-9, example 12 – **1.5 mol**);

a fifth accessory constituent composed of $CaZrO_3$ or a combination of CaO and ZrO_2 (abstract, lines 9-10, example 12 – **1 mol**); and

a sixth accessory constituent composed of an oxide of R2 (wherein R2 is at least one of Y, Dy, Ho, Tb, Gd, and Eu) (example 12 – **2 mol**);

and the crystal particles constituting the dielectric layers have an average particle diameter of not less than 0.2 μm and less than or equal to 0.55 μm (col. 10 lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 2, Sato et al. disclose the dielectric porcelain composite further comprises a seventh accessory constituent, MnO, and in the case of 100 moles of barium titanate, there are 0.01 to 0.5 moles of the seventh accessory constituent (col 9 lines 64-67, col. 10 lines 1-7).

Regarding claims 3, 5, Sato et al. disclose the average particle diameter of the crystal particles constituting the dielectric layers is in the range of not less than 0.2 and less than or equal to 0.35 μm (col. 10 lines 30-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 4, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 6,403,513) in view of JP 2001-316176 ('176).

Regarding claims 4, 6-8, Sato et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the difference (D100 - D50) between the maximum particle diameter (D100) and the average particle diameter (D50) of the crystal particles constituting the dielectric layers is 0.4 μm .

'176 teaches that controlling the maximum particle diameter and the average particle diameter of the crystal particles forms a dielectric ceramic having excellent stability of the dielectric constant [0015]. The difference (D100 - D50) being about 0.3 μm (abstract – sample E).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the ceramic layers of Sato et al., so that the barium titanate has a D100 - D50 being about 0.3 μm or less, to obtain a ceramic capacitor having excellent dielectric constant stability.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-1985. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 5:30 AM - 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on 571-272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eric Thomas/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2831